



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55440-1022

COPY MAILED

JUN 1 6 2009

In re Patent No. 7,437,018 : **OFFICE OF PETITIONS**
Issued: October 14, 2008 :
Application No. 10/714,514 : PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
Filed: November 14, 2003 :
Dkt. No.: 07844-597001 / P550 :

This is a decision on the "APPLICATION FOR PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT UNDER 37 CFR 1.705(d)", filed November 24, 2008.

The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment (PTA) is **DISMISSED**.

The above-identified application matured into U.S. Pat. No. 7,437,018 on October 14, 2008. The patent issued with a PTA 762 days. The request for reconsideration of patent term adjustment was timely filed within two months of the issue date of the patent. See, 37 CFR 1.705(d). Patentees request that the patent term adjustment be increased from 762 days to 1,336 days.

Patentees request reconsideration of the patent term adjustment based on the decision in Wyeth v. Dudas, 580 F. Supp. 2d 138, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1538 (D.D.C. 2008). Patentees contend that pursuant to Wyeth, a PTO delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) overlaps with a delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) only if the delays occur on the same day.

Patentees maintain that the period of adjustment due to the three year delay by the Office, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(b), of 574 days and the period of adjustment due to examination delay, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a), of 795 days do not overlap as these periods do not occur on the same day. The 574-day period is calculated based on the application having been filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on November 14, 2003 and the application having issued as a patent on October 14, 2008. Patentees assert that in addition to this 574-day period, they are entitled to a period of adjustment due to examination delay pursuant to 37 CFR 1.702(a) of 795 days.

Under 37 CFR 1.703(f), patentees are entitled to a period of patent term adjustment equal to the period of delays based on the grounds set forth in 37 CFR 1.702 reduced by the period of time equal to the period of time during which patentees failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution pursuant to 37 CFR 1.704. In other words, patentees are entitled to the period of Office delay reduced by the period of applicant delay.

Patentees do not dispute that the total period of Office delay is the sum of the period of three years delay and the period of examination delay, to the extent that these periods of delay are not overlapping. However, in effect, patentees contend that only a portion of the three year delay period overlaps with the period of examination delay. Accordingly, patentees submit that the total period of adjustment for Office delay is 1,369 days (the sum of the period of three year delay (700 days) and the period of examination delay (795 days), reduced by 126 days of overlap). As such, patentees assert entitlement to a patent term adjustment of 1,336 days (700 days *plus* 795 days *less* 126 days of overlap *less* 33 days of applicant delay).

The Office agrees that as of the issuance of the patent on October 14, 2008, the application was pending three years and 700 days after its filing date. The Office agrees that certain action was not taken within a specified time frame, and, thus, the entry of a period of adjustment of 795 days is correct. At issue is whether patentees should accrue an additional 700 days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent as well as 795 days for Office failure to take a certain action within a specified time frame (or examination delay).

The Office contends that 700 days overlap. Patentees' calculation of the period of overlap is inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of this provision. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

To the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

Likewise, 35 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in § 1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule, 65 Fed. Reg. 56366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See, also, Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004). See, also, Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004).

The current wording of § 1.703(f) was revised in response to the misinterpretation of this provision by a number of Patentees. The rule was slightly revised to more closely track the corresponding language of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). The relevant

portion differs only to the extent that the statute refers back to provisions of the statute whereas the rule refers back to sections of the rule. This was not a substantive change to the rule nor did it reflect a change of the Office's interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). As stated in the Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f) and of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding § 1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed. The grounds specified in these sections cover the A) guarantee of prompt Patent and Trademark Office responses, B) guarantee of no more than 3-year application pendency, and C) guarantee or adjustments for delays due to interference, secrecy orders and appeals. A section by section analysis of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) specifically provides that:

Section 4402 imposes limitations on restoration of term. In general, pursuant to [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(2)(A)-(C), total adjustments granted for restorations under [35 U.S.C. 154](b)(1) are reduced as follows: (1) To the extent that there are multiple grounds for extending the term of a patent that may exist simultaneously (e.g., delay due to a secrecy order under [35 U.S.C.] 181 and administrative delay under [35 U.S.C.] 154(b)(1)(A)), the term should not be extended for each ground of delay but only for the actual number of days that the issuance of a patent was delayed; See, 145 Cong. Rec. S14,718¹.

¹ The AIPA is title IV of the Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999 (S. 1948), which was incorporated and enacted as law as part of Pub. L. 106-113. The Conference Report for H.R. 3194, 106th Cong. 1st Sess. (1999), which resulted in Pub. L. 106-113, does not contain any discussion (other than the incorporated language) of S. 1948. A section-by-

As such, the period for over three-year pendency does not overlap only to the extent that the actual dates in the period beginning three years after the date on which the application was filed overlap with the actual dates in the periods for failure of the Office to take action within specified time frames. In other words, consideration of the overlap does not begin three years after the filing date of the application.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay "overlap" under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the entire period during which the application was pending before the Office, November 14, 2003, to the date the patent issued on October 14, 2008. Prior to the issuance of the patent, 795 days of patent term adjustment were accorded for the Office failing to respond within a specified time frame during the pendency of the application.

The application actually issued three years and 700 days after its filing date. However, the Office did not delay 700 days and then delay an additional 795 days. Accordingly, 795 days of patent term adjustment (not 795 days and 700 days) was properly entered because the entire period of delay of 700 days attributable to the delay in the issuance of the patent overlaps with the adjustment of 795 days attributable to grounds specified in § 1.702(a)(1). Entry of both periods is not warranted.

In view thereof, no adjustment to the patent term will be made.

The Office acknowledges submission of the required application fee of \$200.00. See, 37 CFR 1.18(e).

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3205.



Alesia M. Brown
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions